

To: Johnson, Kathleen[Johnson.Kathleen@epa.gov]
From: Blumenfeld, Jared
Sent: Fri 9/5/2014 8:36:33 PM
Subject: Re: EPA Meeting Next Week

I'm going to be 15 min late for our 2 - so now 215

Jared Blumenfeld
EPA

On Sep 5, 2014, at 1:01 PM, "Johnson, Kathleen" <Johnson.Kathleen@epa.gov> wrote:

Will,

Thanks for your note and we would offer the following suggestions.

We agree that the real value of this meeting will be to delve into specific discussions of our major points. We could structure those discussions around our major environmental issues which we would break out as follows:

- I. Concerns about Water Quality Standards Exceedances
 - a. EC/Salinity
 - b. X-2
 - c. Bromide
 - d. Mercury
 - e. Dissolved Oxygen
 - f. Selenium
- II. Fish and Aquatic Resource Concerns/NEPA Effects
 - a. Entrainment
 - b. Rearing Conditions
 - c. Migration
 - d. Spawning

At the conclusion of the discussion, we would hope to identify issues of disagreement and whether they are of a technical nature, a policy nature, or perhaps merely language issues in the DEIS. We should strive to figure out which ones would be appropriate for the principals to tackle at their meeting.

We think that representative from the State Board are important to this meeting. As we understand it, one of the responses to our concern of water quality violations has been a plan to change the compliance points. As this would require approval by the State Board, their views are important. Also, it's important for everyone to understand that the State Board has an ongoing process to review and change the water quality standards for the delta, so we view them as essential to the conversation.

On the issue of the Supplemental, I think we would all agree that we want the project to be in a better place (from the NEPA perspective) at the conclusion of the Supplemental. Our perspective on the scope of the Supplemental is critical to future success. It doesn't need to be an agenda item for Tuesday, but we hope that there will be appropriate opportunity for us to talk with you all about it. It's also possible that the discussion on Tuesday will, to some extent, reveal some opportunities for "fixes" which might be possible through the Supplemental.

Please feel free to give me a call to discuss further. We are looking forward to a productive meeting on Tuesday.

Kathleen H. Johnson

Director, Enforcement Division

U.S. EPA - Region 9

75 Hawthorne Street ENF-1

San Francisco, CA 94015

415/972-3873

johnson.kathleen@epa.gov

From: will.stelle@noaa.gov [mailto:will.stelle@noaa.gov]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 2:18 PM

To: Maria Rea; Johnson, Kathleen; Goforth, Kathleen

Cc: Moon, Laura K.@DWR; Jason R Phillips; Ryan Wulff; Michelle Banonis; Larry Rabin; David Murillo; Ren Lohofener; Dan Castleberry; Bonham, Chuck@Wildlife; Carl Wilcox; Mark Cowin; Blumenfeld, Jared

Subject: EPA Meeting Next Week

Dear Kathleen J and Kathleen G: We (the core Federal BDCP team) have participate in some good and very useful discussions with the state over the last two days on BDCP related matters, including how to address the major EPA comments. All good. Obviously, there are strong views on the general topic, but I am confident that we can make good progress on them.

I would like to suggest some slight adjustments in Tuesday's meeting. Fundamentally, they reflect a perspective that this will be a working session where we delve into a discussion of your major comments so that we can begin to plumb how best to address them, or whether in fact some represent misunderstandings, or whatever. . . . Lets assume that all the participants have read the comments.

To foster this, I would suggest a more focused agenda that skips a generic presentation of the EPA comments and delves directly into a focused and organized discussion of the top tier topics. I do not think a general open Q and A framing is sufficiently organized. I would also not try to get into issues of the scope of the supplement yet, believing that we need to plough into the underpinnings of the major topics and discern where there is agreement, fundamental disagreements, differing understandings of the program itself or the current effects analyses and their implications.

Perhaps we can structure the agenda around headings of the major topics broached by the EPA letter. List those major topics, perhaps a half dozen at most, and then organize the discussion around each.

I would also recommend narrowing the range of invited entities to enable this deeper discussion to occur. NRCS? No. And whether we should fold in state board staff participation might be an open issue.

I'll visit with Maria tomorrow morning on this, and then we can either email some specific ideas or do a quick call. I would recommend that we loop in Laura King Moon from the state side in the discussion, and perhaps their ICF technical consultant lead too.

So, more tomorrow.

Lots of fun, and I hope we can make good progress next week.

Many thanks,

WS

William Stelle Jr.
Regional Administrator
West Coast Region
NOAA Fisheries
206-526-6150